

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

CONSULATE GENERAL OF INDIA IN NEW YORK,

Plaintiff,

-v-

834 5TH AVENUE CORPORATION, *et al.*,

Defendants.

24 Civ. 9913 (PAE)

ORDER

PAUL A. ENGELMAYER, District Judge:

On December 23, 2024, plaintiff Consulate General of India in New York (the “Consulate General”) filed this action, seeking, *inter alia*, a declaration that the Consulate General has the right to build a fire exit between a building it owns at 3 East 64th Street, New York, NY, and an adjacent building. *See* Dkt. 1 (Complaint). The Consulate General has yet to serve the Summons and Complaint on defendants, or if the Consulate General has done so, it has not filed proof of such service.

The Court is in receipt of a letter from the Consulate General requesting that the Court place “Complainant’s case in entirety” under seal. Dkt. 3. The letter conclusorily asserts that “an overriding interest” in “confidentiality and privacy” supports this application, but it does not explain particular reasons for seeking to file *any* information under seal—much less the “case in entirety”—as required by Rule 4.B.2 of the Court’s Individual Rules and Practice in Civil Cases. *See, e.g.*, Dkt. 3 at 2 (alluding to unspecified “threats” made to the Consulate General “in the past,” which it acknowledges “are not necessarily related to this matter”); *see also, e.g., Lugosch v. Pyramid Co. of Onondaga*, 435 F.3d 110, 119–20, 124 (2d Cir. 2006) (“[T]he First Amendment does secure to the public and to the press a right of access to civil proceedings.”); *In*

*re Gen. Motors LLC Ignition Switch Litig.*, No. 14 Md. 2543 (JMF), 2015 WL 4750774, at \*4 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 11, 2015). Accordingly, the Court denies the Consulate General's request without prejudice to its ability to renew it upon compliance with Rule 4.B.2.

SO ORDERED.

  
PAUL A. ENGELMAYER  
United States District Judge

Dated: January 2, 2025  
New York, New York